



RCE/2814  
#16 RCE  
4/14/03  
amr

**REQUEST FOR  
CONTINUED EXAMINATION (RCE)  
TRANSMITTAL**

Subsection (b) of 35 U.S.C. § 132, effective on May 29, 2000 provides for continued examination of a utility or plant application filed on or after June 8, 1995.

See The American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA)

Application Number: 09/688,989

Filing Date: October 17, 2000

First Named Inventor: Yoshitaka Tsunashima

Group Art Unit: 2814

Examiner: S. Rao

Attorney Docket Number: 04329.1952-01000

Attorney Customer Number: 22,852

This is a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 of the above-identified application.

**Note:** 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 is effective on May 29, 2000. If the above-identified application was filed prior to May 29, 2000, applicant may wish to consider filing a continued prosecution application (CPA) under 37 C.F.R. § 1.53(d) instead of a RCE to be eligible for patent term adjustment provisions of the AIPA. See "Changes to Application Examination and Provisional Application Practice," Interim Rule, 65 Fed. Reg. 14865 (March 20, 2000). Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 47 (April 11, 2000), which established RCE practice.

**1. Submission required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114:**

a. ☐ Previously submitted

- i. ☐ Consider the amendment(s)/reply after final under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 previously filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- ii. ☐ Consider the arguments in the Appeal Brief of Reply Brief previously filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- iii. ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

b. ☒ Enclosed:

- i. ☒ Amendment/Reply
- ii. ☐ Affidavit(s)/Declaration(s)
- iii. ☐ Information Disclosure Statement
- iv. ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED  
APR 10 2003  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

**2. Miscellaneous**

- a. ☐ Suspension of action on the above-mentioned application is requested under 37 C.F.R. § 1.103(c) for a period of \_\_\_\_\_ months. (Period of suspension shall not exceed 3 months; fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(i) required.)
- b. ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

**3. Fees**

a. ☒ The filing fee is calculated as follows:

04/10/2003 CV0111 00000026 09688989

- i. ☒ \$750.00 RCE fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(e) FC:1801 750.00 OP
- ii. ☒ Request for extension of time for (Two Months) \$410.00
- iii. ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

b. ☐ Check in the amount of \$1160.00 enclosed.

c. ☒ The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies in the filing fees, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

**Signature of Applicant, Attorney, or Agent Required**

Name: Bryan S. Latham

Reg. No.: 49,085

Signature: *Bryan S. Latham*

Date: April 8, 2003


**Certificate of Mailing or Transmission**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, BOX RCE, Washington, D.C. 20231, or facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on:

Name:

Signature:

Date:



# 17 Resp.  
4/14/03  
arr

PATENT  
Customer No. 22,852  
Attorney Docket No. 04329.1952-01

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: )  
Yoshitaka Tsunashima et al. ) Group Art Unit: 2814  
Application No.: 09/688,989 ) Examiner: S. Rao  
Filed: October 17, 2000 )  
For: SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE AND )  
METHOD OF MANUFACTURING )  
THE SAME )

Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, DC 20231

Sir:

RECEIVED  
APR 10 2003  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

In reply to the Final Office Action of November 8, 2002, the period for reply to having been extended to April 8, 2003 by filing of a Request for Extension of Time and payment of appropriate fees, and prosecution on the merits having been reopened by a Request for Continued Examination filed concurrently herewith, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the subject application for the following reasons.

**REMARKS**

In the Final Office Action ("FOA"), the Examiner maintained the rejection of claims 27, 28, 30, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; maintained the rejection of claims 27, 28, and 30-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; and maintained the rejection of claims 27, 28, and 30-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kume et al., U.S. Patent No.